



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,409	02/21/2002	Shubhen Kapila	399756	2767 <i>J</i>
30954	7590	09/12/2003		
LATHROP & GAGE LC 2345 GRAND AVENUE SUITE 2800 KANSAS CITY, MO 64108			EXAMINER	
			LOVERING, RICHARD D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1712	

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	10/081,409	Applicant(s)	KAPILA ET AL
Examiner	LOVERING	Group Art Unit	1712

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

Responsive to communication(s) filed on JULY 10, 2003.

This action is FINAL.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1-5, 9-14, 16, 31 AND 32 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 1-5, 9-14, 16, 31 AND 32 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Attachment(s)

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____ Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit 1712

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

2. Claims 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cazenave 4,118,521, esp. Examples 1 and

3. While Cazenave may not state that his compositions are solvents for extracting oil-bearing material containing a combination of triglyceride oil and phospholipid oil, the recitation of a new or different intended use does not render an old composition new or patentable. See In re Thuau, 1943 C.D. 390; 554 O.G. 14; and In re Zierden, 411 F. 2d 1325; 162 USPQ 102.

3. Claims 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kresse 4,059,604, esp. Example IV. While Kresse may not state that his compositions are solvents for extracting oil-bearing material containing a combination of triglyceride oil and phospholipid oil, the recitation of a new or different intended use does not render an old composition new or patentable. See the decisions cited in the preceding paragraph.

4. The non-statutory double patenting rejection, whether of the obvious-type or non-obvious-type, is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent. *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); *In re Van Ornam*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); and *In re Goodman*, 29 USPQ 2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Art Unit 1712

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321 (b) and (c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.78 (d).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a Terminal Disclaimer. A Terminal Disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73 (b).

5. Claims 1-5, 9-14, 16, 31 and 32 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 31 and 32 of copending application Serial No. 10/081,319. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims read on, or at least overlap, the claims of the '319 application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

6. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 9-14, 16, 31 and 32 have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

7. Applicants should revise the paragraph inserted on page 1 of the specification (by pre-amendment A filed February 21, 2002) to recite the status of the parent case, now U.S. Patent No. 6,547,987.

8. Note that U.S. Patent No. 6,547,978 is cited on the attached Form PTO-892.

Art Unit 1712

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lovering whose telephone number is (703) 308-0443. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. from 7:30 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Dawson, can be reached on (703) 308-2340. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

R. Lovering:cdc
September 10, 2003

Richard D Lovering
RICHARD D. LOVERING
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1700 1700